



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

just as the older development did? The reduction of *étoile* to *étéle*. The wide *i*, which is generally regarded as quite foreign to French, is found in some French dialects. It is commoner now about Paris than it was a few years ago. I think it is not improbable that the French language will, in time, develop a complete system of wide vowels.

Prof. A. F. CHAMBERLAIN said that wide *i* was common in Canadian French, its prevalence being probably due to English influence.

Dr. J. E. MATZKE wished to add a few words to his former remarks:—

It seems to me that the form *mangi* may be due to the regular operation of BARTSCH's law. As for *avou*, *savou*, they are doubtless derived from *avoir*, *savoir*+*ou*, *sou* (= *habutum*, *saputum*).

Prof. LOGIE expressed the opinion that if the form *mangi* were due to the operation of BARTSCH's law, we should find some traces of the development in the manuscripts.

The meeting was then adjourned.

In the evening following the fifth session, the members of the Association were most hospitably entertained at the house of Prof. A. MELVILLE BELL (1525 Thirty-fifth St.), where a charming social reception was held in accordance with the announcement in the program. A delightful opportunity was offered here for becoming personally acquainted with many of the leading literary and scientific people of Washington.

## SIXTH SESSION.

The Association met for its **Sixth Session** at ten o'clock, A. M. (December 31), with Prof. KENT in the Chair.

The Chairman. The Association will come to order. I announce, as the first contribution for this morning, the paper that was postponed from the Fourth Session entitled: "The Law Language in England from Edward I. (A.D. 1274) to Henry VIII. (A.D. 1509)," by Prof. B. F. O'CONNOR (Columbia College).

Discussion was opened on this paper by Prof. A. M. ELLIOTT (Johns Hopkins University), who said:—

Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks on this paper, though it belongs almost as much in the province of the English as that of

the French or the Romance languages. Dr. O'CONNOR has touched particularly on the importance of the Law Books from the legal point of view, their importance as a collection of documents for the lawyer. I wish to call your attention to their importance for both Romance scholars on the one hand and English scholars on the other, from their literary and linguistic side.

The first and most important contribution that could be made with reference to them, and it would seem an absolutely necessary one so far as language is concerned, is that a dictionary should be made of this language. Prof. SKEAT in the Second Series of his 'Principles of English Etymology' has noted this point, and he himself as the President of the Philological Association of London, has published several word-lists amounting to two or three thousand. That is an important step, but what we need more than anything else is a publication of a complete dictionary or vocabulary of all the words contained in these various reports.

I think a dictionary might be made from the documents published by the English government. Of course, such a thing as this could be controlled afterward by manuscript work. That, to my mind, is the most important, and first thing to do with reference to these Year Books. As Prof. SKEAT, in the book referred to, remarks, it is an astonishing thing that hundreds of years should have passed in England with all this law literature in the background, and that there should never have been any attempt to get out a vocabulary of it.

In the sixteenth century there was a dictionary gotten out, but it amounts to really nothing.

From the linguistic side, then, the first point that I want to make is the necessity of a dictionary, and were I going to work in the field it would be the first thing I should wish to have before me: the words, the forms, the material, the linguistic material as given in the vocabulary.

In taking up the technical side of the question for Anglo-Norman French, there have been two or three critical articles published which are of importance for this work, not that the authors touch on the Law Books definitely, but they draw from the literature in order to show what the form of this French must have been on the English soil, and how certain changes in language took place a short time after the French arrived there, and which continued until the withdrawal of French from the law courts or the withdrawal of Anglo-Norman literature from the English soil.

Again: for the worker on this linguistic side there have been a number of works published by German scholars bearing on the Norman French, and the Norman French being connected so intimately with the Anglo-Norman French throws light on the subject. SUCHIER'S *Bibliotheca Normannica* draws extensively on original sources and enables one to compare their language with the language of the law books, not for style, because the former are literary pro-

ductions, but for words and forms, for phonetics, the changes of the words as having gone into Anglo-Norman French from the Norman proper.

Here, then, are a few points that I want to bring out. The whole study is something that cannot be too highly recommended to young scholars who want to go into this kind of work. It is a field little known. The Anglo-Norman literature we are beginning to get a hold of, so that we can manage it. We can manage Anglo-Norman verse. We can tell something of the influence the language had on English, but these other great sources opening up vistas for speech mixture, for the treatment of all kinds of questions and problems in language proper, have hardly been touched upon at all and to the astonishment of everybody, certainly the English have done next to nothing.

I should be glad to hear from our English scholars present, in regard to these Year Books.

Dr. O'CONNOR. I would like to add to what Prof. ELLIOTT has said that the question of getting up a dictionary was one of the first to suggest itself to Prof. T. W. DWIGHT and myself when the subject of making law students familiar with the texts of the Year-Books, was discussed. The great difficulty about it was to get men who could do it, and the money to pay them for their work. If these two elements could be somehow or other obtained we could compile such a dictionary in a couple of years. With reference to this work I may say that one of the most prominent professors of Law in Cambridge Univ., England, Mr. F. W. MAITLAND, writing sometime ago in the *Political Science Quarterly*, said he was very glad to hear that Americans were taking up the subject that Englishmen had neglected, and he hoped they would go on and do for English legal history what England's own sons could not or did not do.

Mr. SHELDON. There are some points that suggest themselves to me which I should like to bring out more fully.

One of these is the difficulty in the way of constructing a dictionary on the plan proposed. I do not like to be considered as casting a damper on the project of forming a dictionary, but I want to say that I know of no man in the world competent to do that work except professional students of language. I do not know a man in England who is competent to do it, and is not otherwise engaged. I may be wrong. Possibly there are some students of law in England who have what is absolutely indispensable, if the work is to have its proper linguist in value, that is to say, a philological knowledge of the old Anglo-Norman. It will be impossible to do it well without a knowledge of the Old French of France. That knowledge should not be merely an ability to read Old French, but it must be a philological knowledge.

It is particularly necessary in a work of this sort that the question

of spelling should not be allowed to interfere with a man's perception of what the probable pronunciation was. He must always have the idea that the spelling of Anglo-French represents in part the regular changes of the French, complicated by the influence of the French spelling usual in France, and by the influence of the English language of England on the French as spoken in England. The Anglo-French was a rapidly changing language, and all the productions in Anglo-French were somewhat under artificial influence. They were often written in more or less conscious and direct imitation of continental French works, and under artificial influences shown in the spelling of the words. It would be interesting to show that in modern English spelling many peculiarities of Continental Old French spelling have been preserved which, properly speaking, should have disappeared altogether in Anglo-French, and they did for a time largely disappear, but have been more or less preserved down to our own day. I might mention a single example where it absolutely asserted that the Old French spelling has been preserved by tradition. The modern French word spelled "chef" was in Old French spelling "chief," that is, the regular form of the Old French word was what it is now in modern English. Of course, the Old French *chief* was not pronounced as in modern English.

It was said that the law French was in some respects different from the literary French as furnishing a different kind of material for the linguistic study of the French of England. I suppose it was not intended to represent that the law French of England was not to some extent, perhaps, often to a greater extent than the ordinary literary French, subject to such artificial influences as I have spoken of.

Mr. GARNETT. I should like to say one word. I wish very much that some one, a member of the Association or other person, would undertake the preparation of a work showing that influence. Whatever may be the defects of Prof. SKEAT's book, it is the only thing that I know of which goes into that matter and which gives us, at least, material to use. I sent for BEHREND's book, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Französischen Sprache in England, I.*, that Prof. ELLIOTT referred to, and received it a few days ago, but I have not had an opportunity to examine it yet. It seems to me that it is of great importance in the history of English to investigate the influence of this Anglo-Norman dialect, which was used in England during the period that Dr. O'CONNOR referred to in his paper read this morning, and to trace out that influence in detail upon the English of that time.

Prof. SHELDON. I should like to say with reference to that, that the publication of Prof. SKEAT's work made me hesitate. I still hope to carry out that plan at some time in the future. The subject is one upon which I have been more or less at work for several years, with particular reference to the influence of French on English, though the influence of both sides, of course, would have to be considered.

Prof. GARNETT. I should like to have the next paper postponed for a few minutes in order that the Committee on the place of next meeting may report.

The Chairman. If there be no objection it will be so ordered.—There was no objection.

Prof. GARNETT. The Committee reports in favor of holding the next meeting in Washington City. It reports further that it is advisable to hold a meeting of the Association in Chicago in the summer of 1893, as it is requested in a letter from Chicago. The report is signed by all the members of the Committee.

I will simply say in explanation of the recommendation that the suggestion was made to the Committee that it would be advisable to adopt Washington as the place of permanent meeting of the Association, just as the Historical Society has done, but the Committee does not like to go so far as that. It would like to test the feeling of the Association again, and would recommend that we meet next year in Washington during the Christmas holidays. The report reads as follows :

The Committee on place of next meeting of the Association respectfully reports in favor of holding that meeting in Washington City. It reports further, that it is advisable to hold a meeting of the Association in Chicago in the summer of 1893, as requested in the letter from Chicago which was referred to the Committee.

JAMES M. GARNETT,  
EDW. L. WALTER,  
HERMANN COLLITZ.

Adopted.

I hold in my hand a letter which was referred to the Committee by the Secretary of the Association from Mr. PAYNE, who is the Chairman of the Committee on Philology in connection with the World's Congress, and he requests that this Association, as well as the Philological and other Associations, shall hold a meeting in Chicago in the summer of 1893, and the Committee, therefore, recommends it, without determining whether that shall be a regular meeting or a special meeting.

Profr. SHELDON moved that the report of the Committee be adopted.

The Chairman. The first suggestion is that the meeting of the Association be held in Washington.

Prof. MATZKE. I think it is of the greatest importance that if there be in the minds of the members of the Association any objection to holding the meetings permanently in Washington, that these should be stated now. I, myself, am highly in favor of making Washington the regular place of meeting.

I was in the West last year while the meeting was held in Nashvill, and I confess that I hesitated a moment to go there, whereas, I